



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/092,554      | 03/08/2002  | Yasutaka Ishii       | 3273-0153P          | 1456             |

2292 7590 05/03/2005

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

SHIAO, REI TSANG

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1626

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO./<br>CONTROL NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR /<br>PATENT IN REEXAMINATION | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|

10/092,554

03/08/2002

3273-0153P

EXAMINER

Robert Shiao

ART UNIT

PAPER

1626

0405


DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Applicant's filed Appeal Brief, dated April 08, 2005, is acknowledged, but it is not considered because applicants have not paid fee for extension of time as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). However, applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 4 and 10 under obviousness-type double patenting over Ishii et al. US 6,232,258, or under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is noted that the instant claim 10 or 4 is drawn to a catalyst comprising a compound of formula (II) without limitation of the catalyst and the variable Rx, which still renders obviousness-type double patenting over Ishii et al. US 6,232,258. The instant claim 10 recites the limitation "comprising", which is an open-end language and comprise products other than the compound of formula (II), i.e., acid or strong acid, see pages 17-21, and examples on pages 113-120. Moreover, it is noted that the alkoxyl of alkoxycarbonyl group of variables R3-R6 of Ishii et al. formula (Ic) is having about 1 to 10 carbon atoms, which is embraced in the instant range of five or more carbon atoms of variable Rx, see Ishii et al. '258, column 3, lines 32-38, and column 17, lines 59-64.

It is suggested that applicants amend claim 10, i.e., a catalyst of formula (II), wherein Rx is a hydrocarbon group having five to twenty carbon atoms, ....., optionally comprising a metallic compound, would obviate rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, or obvious-type double patenting.

  
TAOFIQ SOLOLA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1626

RS- 4/26/5